

## REMARKS

The Office action dated October 18, 2006 has been carefully considered. Claims 1-20 and 26-28 are active in this application. Further examination and reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-20 and 26-28 are respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-7, 14, 18, 20 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Adachi (US 6,877,037) is respectfully traversed. However, in order to further define applicant's invention "macro for communication" has been substituted for "data object." (Page 6 of applicants' specification supports this change) in the amendments to independent claims 1, 14, 18, and 20. Claim 1 now recites "each macro for communication being representative of a message for communication between a wireless communication device and a device connected to a network." Further, claim 1 recites the data object update message being capable of changing the meaning of the macro in connection with communications between the MCT and the device, subsequent to the transmission of the data object update message, referencing a macro number corresponding to an associated macro," Adachi does not disclose these limitations and it is not concerned with communications using "macros." Once data is updated on a client terminal in connection with a request message there is no teaching or suggestion in Adachi of an "update message being capable of changing the meaning of the macro in connection with communications between the MCT and the device, subsequent to the transmission of the data object update message, referencing a macro number corresponding to an associated macro. Claim 14 now recites a receiver including a memory coupled to a" transceiver for storing macros for communication, each macro for communication corresponding to a macro number." Further, claim 14 now recites, the receiver being operable to communicate with one or more devices in the network using macro numbers. No such disclosure is made in Adachi.

Dependent claim 16 has been amended to recite each macro for communication as representing "an encoded message, the message being capable of being changed in connection with the data update request message." The data object number formerly recited in claim 16 is now recited in claim 14 as a macro number.

Claim 18 now recites “each macro for communication representing an encoded message and corresponding to a macro number for transmission over the network.” No such disclosure is found in Adachi since data objects numbers aren’t used for the purpose of communication in Adachi.

Claim 20 now recites a method of maintaining a distributed object system using a network over which encoded messages are communicated using macro numbers. Claim 20 now further recites “transmitting updated data to the wireless communication device if said OVSN is not equal to said local OVSN, the updated data including at least one macro for communication representing an encoded message for communications from a MCT using a macro number corresponding to the macro for communication.” These limitations are neither taught nor suggested by Adachi.

In summary, as is evident from the amended independent claims discussed, Adachi is not concerned with updating data objects or macros pursuant to use of those macros for communication purposes through transmission of object numbers between or among network devices.

The rejection of claims 11-13, 16-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Adachi in view of Sakakura (U.S. 6,389,423) and La Due (U.S. 6,285,868) is respectfully traversed. Neither these references taken singly nor in combination teach, suggest or make obvious: a “macro for communication being representative of a message for communication between a mobile communication transceiver (MCT) and a device connected to a network, with the data object update message being changing the meaning of the macro in connection with communications between the MCT and the device, subsequent to the transmission of the data object update message, referencing a macro number corresponding to an associated macro” as recited in claim 1. These references also fail to teach, suggest or make obvious a “receiver being operable to communicate with one or more devices in the network using macro numbers” as recited in claim 14. Moreover, these references taken singly or in combination fail to teach, suggest or make obvious storing macros for communication wherein each macro for communication represents an encoded message and corresponds to “a macro number for transmission over the network,” as recited in claim 18.

Claims dependent from the rejected independent claims are submitted as being patentably distinct from the cited references since they merely contain limitations in addition to those claims from which they depend.

The rejection of claims 1, 14, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is respectfully traversed. However, it is submitted that this rejection has been certainly overcome by the foregoing amendments made to claims 1, 14, 18 and 20 which further specify and define applicants' invention.

### REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 25, 2007

By: Richard A. Bachand  
Richard A. Bachand  
Reg.No. 25,107  
(858) 845-8503

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121  
Telephone: (858) 658-5787  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502